



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/625,586	07/26/2000	Jason T. Sterne	14004100291	8281

25697 7590 08/09/2004

ROSS D. SNYDER & ASSOCIATES, INC.
115 WILD BASIN RD.
SUITE 107
AUSTIN, TX 78746

EXAMINER

ODLAND, DAVID E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2662

DATE MAILED: 08/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/625,586

Applicant(s)

STERNE ET AL.

Examiner

David Odland

Art Unit

2662

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 March 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The following is a response to the amendments filed on 05/19/2004.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 23,24,32 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 23 recites "...selecting a selected virtual connection of a plurality of virtual connections..." in line 3. This limitation is confusing since there is no previous mention of any selecting any virtual connections and it is unclear why a selected VC is further being selected (i.e. 'selecting a selected' VC).

Claim 24 is rejected because it depends on claim 23.

Claim 32 recites "...the ingress line card selects the selected transport interface by selecting the transport interface group based...and by selecting the selected transport interface from the plurality of transport interface..." in lines 1-4. This claim is confusing; it is unclear what is being selected and how the selection is determined.

Claim 33 is rejected because it depends on claim 32.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Art Unit: 2662

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1,2,6,7,17,22,23 and 25, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Puntambekar at al. (USPN 6,097,726), hereafter referred to as Puntambekar.

Referring to claims 1,2,6,7,17,22,23 and 25, Puntambekar discloses a multi-protocol switch (an ATM and IP switch (see figure 4)), comprising a plurality of egress line cards, wherein each of the plurality of egress line cards supports at least one egress connection (the switch comprises a plurality of egress line cards (see figure 4 and columns 5 and 6)), a switching fabric operably coupled to the plurality of egress line cards; and an ingress line card operably coupled to the switching fabric (the cards are part of a network switch (see figure 4)), wherein the ingress line card receives cells over a plurality of ingress connections (each switch receives ATM cells (see figure 4 and column 9 line 59 through column 10 line 26)), wherein each cell includes an ingress connection identifier (each cell includes a VPI (see figure 4 and column 9 line 59 through column 10 line 26)), wherein the ingress line card determines a cell protocol for each cell based on the ingress connection identifier corresponding to the cell (the ingress card determines if it is to act as a leaf switch or a root switch depending on the VPI (see figure 4 and column 9 line 59 through column 10 line 26)), wherein when the cell protocol is a first protocol, the ingress line card determines a forwarding decision based on the input connection identifier

Art Unit: 2662

for the cell (if the switch is to act as a leaf switch it forwards the cell by changing the VPI (see figure 4 and column 9 line 59 through column 10 line 26)), wherein when the cell protocol is a second protocol, the ingress line card determines the forwarding decision based on a destination address for a packet to which the cell corresponds (if the switch is to act as a root switch it collects the corresponding cells that make up a packet and forwards the packet according to the destination address of the packet (see figure 4 and column 9 line 59 through column 10 line 26)), wherein the ingress line card forwards at least a portion of the cell over the switching fabric to at least one of the plurality of egress line cards based on the forwarding decision (the cells and/or frames are forwarded based on the protocol determination to be output from the switching node to either the next leaf switch or the destination node (see figure 4 and column 9 line 59 through column 10 line 26));

wherein the ingress line card includes a lookup table (the ingress card uses a VC data structure array to make the forwarding decisions (see column 5 lines 40-67)), wherein the lookup table stores protocol information for each ingress connection of the plurality of ingress connections (the VC data structure includes VC entries which are related to particular protocols (see column 6)), wherein the ingress line card references the lookup table to determine the cell protocol for each cell received (the ingress card uses the VC entries to determine if the switch is a root of leaf switch (see figure 4 and column 9 line 59 through column 10 line 26));

a plurality of transport interfaces between the ingress line card and the plurality of egress line cards, wherein each transport interface of the plurality of transport interfaces provides a route from the ingress line card across the switching fabric to a destination egress line card of the plurality of egress line cards, wherein determining a forwarding decision based on the destination

Art Unit: 2662

address include determining a selected transport interface of the plurality of transport interfaces (inherently, the ingress and egress cards of the switch have related transport interfaces which are used when the cells are switched between them (see figure 4));

a transport interface group (TIG) between the ingress line card and a first egress line card of the plurality of egress line cards, wherein the TIG includes a plurality of transport interfaces, wherein each transport interface of the plurality of transport interfaces is characterized by a plurality of transport parameters, herein determining a forwarding decision based on the destination address includes selecting a transport interface of the plurality of transport interfaces based on a class of service associated with the cell (inherently, there are transport interfaces between the plurality of cards of the switches and when the packet is reassembled and forwarded to the destination a transport interface is used to do so. Note the switch could not work without transport interfaces (see figure 4)).

forwarding the cell across a switching fabric to at least one selected egress line card of a plurality of egress line cards (the cards are in a switch wherein ingress cards are switched to egress cards (see figure 4)).

when the cell protocol is the first protocol, forwarding the cell across the switching fabric further comprises selecting a selected virtual connection of a plurality of virtual connections across the switching fabric to the selected egress line card and forwarding the cell using the selected virtual connection (when it is determined that a switch is a leaf switch it forwards the cells on according to the VPI (see figure 4 and column 9 line 59 through column 10 line 26)).

when the cell protocol is the second protocol, forwarding the cell across the switching fabric further comprises selecting a selected transport interface of a plurality of transport

Art Unit: 2662

interfaces across the switching fabric to the selected egress line card and forwarding the cell using the selected transport interface (when the switch is a root switch the reassembled packet is inherently sent over a transport interface to an egress card so that it can be forwarded to its destination (see figure 4 and column 9 line 59 through column 10 line 26)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Puntambekar in view of Honda et al. (USPN 6,147,999), hereafter referred to as Honda.

Referring to claim 3, Puntambekar discloses the system discussed above. Furthermore, Puntambekar discloses that when the cell protocol is the second protocol, the ingress switch at least partially assembles the packet to which the cell corresponds to produce a reassembled packet (the ingress card reassembles the cells that make up the packet back into a complete packet (see column 9 and 10)) and forwarding the packet through the switch to the egress card according to the destination address of the packet (see columns 9 and 10)). Puntambekar does not disclose that the ingress line card segments the reassembled packet to produce segmented cells. However, Honda discloses a teaches of a prior art method wherein a packet that has been transported by a plurality of cells is reassembled and then segmented again in order to be forwarded on (see column 1 lines 35-45)). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at

Art Unit: 2662

the time of the invention to perform such operations in the Puntambekar system because doing so would improve bandwidth efficiency. Namely, since packets vary in length, very long one may starve other smaller packets of the available bandwidth, therefore breaking the packets into smaller fixed sized segments (such as ATM cells) will help improve the bandwidth efficiency.

Referring to claim 4, Puntambekar discloses the system discussed above. Furthermore, Puntambekar discloses that when an egress line card of the plurality of egress line cards receives segmented cells, the egress line card reassembles the segmented cells to produce an egress packet, wherein the egress line card forwards the egress packet over at least one selected egress connection based on the destination address for the packet from which the segmented cells were derived. The packet cells are reassembled into a complete packet and forwarded on based on the destination address of the packet (see column 10)).

Referring to claim 5, Puntambekar discloses the system discussed above. Furthermore, Puntambekar discloses forwarding the cells over the switching fabric further comprises forwarding control information with the cells, wherein the control information is used in the determination of the at least one selected egress connection (inherently, the VPI, VCI value are transmitted with the cells as they are transported through the switch and used to route the cells to the proper egress port to be forwarded, thus these values are used for controlling where the cells travel (see figure 4 and columns 9 and 10)). Note, as in claim 3, Puntambekar does not disclose that the cells are cells from a segmented packet, thus see claim 3 for the combination of Puntambekar with Honda.

Art Unit: 2662

8. Claims 8-12,18,19,24,26 and 31-33, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Puntambekar in view of Zheng et al. (USPN 6,611,522), hereafter referred to as Zheng.

Referring to claims 8,12,24 and 26, Puntambekar discloses the system discussed above. Furthermore, Puntambekar discloses that cells of the first protocol are forwarded over the switching fabric to at least one of the plurality of egress line cards using virtual connections within the multi-protocol switch (the cells are forwarded through the switch based on the VPI values (see column 9)). Puntambekar does not disclose that each of the virtual connections is characterized by a plurality of connection parameters, wherein the plurality of connection parameters for a selected virtual connection characterize a class of service provided across the virtual connection or that the transport interfaces are grouped according to the class of service. However, Zheng discloses a system for transporting ATM traffic wherein the ATM connections are given Quality-Of-Service (QOS) requirements that have corresponding parameters (see column 1 lines 33-67)). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to implement the QOS element taught by Zheng in the Puntambekar system because as Zheng point out in column 1 lines 40-49, different types of network traffic require different transmission requirements such as avoiding echoes in voice connections. Thus implementing QOS in Puntambekar would make Puntambekar a more versatile and reliable system.

Referring to claims 9 and 33, Puntambekar discloses the system discussed above. Puntambekar does not disclose that the ingress line card includes, supports and transports packet-over-SONET (POS) frames. However, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to implement POS in the Puntambekar system because doing so

Art Unit: 2662

would make Puntambekar more versatile by allowing the system to support such a protocol.

Also implement an established protocol will reduce the development costs related to having to design an entirely new protocol to use in the Puntambekar system. Note the base claims of claim 33 (claims 31 and 32) are discussed below.

Referring to claims 10 and 11,18, Puntambekar discloses the system discussed above. Puntambekar does not disclose that the first protocol is asynchronous transfer mode (ATM) and the second protocol is Internet Protocol (IP). However, Zheng discloses a system wherein both ATM and IP packets are processed through a switch (see column 2)). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to implement this feature in Puntambekar because doing so would make Puntambekar more flexible in terms of the services it provides.

Referring to claim 19, Puntambekar discloses the system discussed above. Furthermore, Puntambekar discloses that determining the cell protocol further comprises referencing a lookup table using the ingress connection identifier to determine the cell protocol for the cell (a VC entry array is accessed using the VC value of the received cell (see column 9)), wherein the lookup table stores a protocol indication for a plurality of ingress connection identifiers, wherein the ingress connection identifier for the cell is included in the plurality of ingress connection identifiers (the VC Entry array comprises a plurality of VCI/VPI values and tells the switch whether it is a leaf or root switch according to that value (see columns 9 and 10)).

Referring to claims 31 and 32, the claim limitations correspond to similar limitations as that of claim 1 and therefore these limitations are rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 (see the 35 USC 102(e) rejection on claim 1, as discussed above). Puntambekar does not disclose that

Art Unit: 2662

the transport interface or the TIG is grouped according to a class of service. However, Zheng discloses a system for transporting ATM traffic wherein the ATM connections are given Quality-Of-Service (QOS) requirements that have corresponding parameters (see column 1 lines 33-67)). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to implement the QOS element taught by Zheng in the Puntambekar system because as Zheng point out in column 1 lines 40-49, different types of network traffic require different transmission requirements such as avoiding echoes in voice connections. Thus implementing QOS in Puntambekar would make Puntambekar a more versatile and reliable system.

9. Claims 13-16 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Puntambekar in view of Smith et al. (USPN 6,128,649), hereafter referred to as Smith.

Referring to claims 13-16 and 27, Puntambekar discloses the system discussed above. Puntambekar does not disclose the switch operates using a multicasting protocol. However, Smith discloses a system wherein IP or ATM multicasting are used for many advantageous reasons. As Smith points out, in column 25 lines 17-67, IP and ATM multicasting provide good conferencing configurations, reduced processing and resource limitations and avoid certain types of congestion. For these reasons it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to implement a multicasting feature into Puntambekar.

10. Claims 20,28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Puntambekar in view of Honda and further in view of Zheng.

Art Unit: 2662

Referring to claim 20, Puntambekar discloses the system discussed above. Furthermore, Puntambekar discloses routing the cell through the multi-protocol switch based on the destination address further comprises storing the cell with additional cells included in the packet to which the cell corresponds to produce a assembled packet (the cells of the packet are collected to complete the packet (see column 10)); determining the destination address for the packet from at least one cell included in the packet (the destination address of the reassembled packet is inspected (see column 10)) and forwarding the cells based on the destination address (the combined cells that are now a packet are forwarded on according to the destination address see column 10)). Puntambekar does not disclose segmenting the reassembled packet to produce segmentation cells and forwarding segmentation cells. However, Honda discloses a teaches of a prior art method wherein a packet that has been transported by a plurality of cells is reassembled and then segmented again in order to be forwarded on (see column 1 lines 35-45)). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at t he time of the invention to perform such operations in the Puntambekar system because doing so would improve bandwidth efficiency. Namely, since packets vary in length, very long one may starve other smaller packets of the available bandwidth, therefore breaking the packets into smaller fixed sized segments (such as ATM cells) will help improve the bandwidth efficiency.

Referring to claim 28, Puntambekar discloses a multi-protocol switch that supports at least asynchronous transfer mode (ATM) and internet protocol d to (IP) (a multi-protocol switch that supports both IP and ATM (see figure 4)), comprising a plurality of egress line cards, wherein each of the plurality of egress line cards supports at least one egress connection (a plurality of ingress cards that support respective connections (see figure 4)), a switching fabric

Art Unit: 2662

operably coupled to the plurality of egress line cards and an ingress line card operably coupled to the switching fabric (the cards are within a switch (see figure 4)), wherein the ingress line card receives cells over a plurality of ingress connections, wherein each cell includes an ingress connection identifier (the ingress cards receive cells over a plurality of virtual circuits and the cell comprise VCI and VPI values (see figure 4)), the ingress line card forwards the cell across the switching fabric to at least one egress line card of the egress line cards based on the ingress connection identifier for the cell (if the switch is a leaf switch it updates the VPI value of the cell and forwards it on through the switch (see figure 4 and column 9)), the ingress line card at least partially reassembles a packet to which the cell corresponds to produce a reassembled packet (if the switch is a root switch, it reassembles the cell into a packet (see figure 4 and columns 9 and 10)), determines a destination address to which the packet corresponds (the destination address of the complete packet is determined (see column 10)) and forwards the packet across the switching fabric to at least one egress line card of the plurality of egress line cards based on the destination address (the reassembled packet is sent through the switch to be forwarded on to the destination according to the destination address (see figure 4 and column 10)).

Puntambekar does not disclose that the ingress line card segments the reassembled packet to produce segmented cells. However, Honda discloses a teaches of a prior art method wherein a packet that has been transported by a plurality of cells is reassembled and then segmented again in order to be forwarded on (see column 1 lines 35-45)). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to perform such operations in the Puntambekar system because doing so would improve bandwidth efficiency. Namely, since packets vary in length, very long one may starve other smaller packets of the available bandwidth, therefore

Art Unit: 2662

breaking the packets into smaller fixed sized segments (such as ATM cells) will help improve the bandwidth efficiency.

Furthermore, Puntambekar does not disclose that the first protocol is asynchronous transfer mode (ATM) and the second protocol is Internet Protocol (IP). However, Zheng discloses a system wherein both ATM and IP packets are processed through a switch (see column 2)). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to implement this feature in Puntambekar because doing so would make Puntambekar more flexible in terms of the services it provides.

Referring to claim 29, Puntambekar discloses the system discussed above. Furthermore, Puntambekar discloses that frame is transported across a transport interface (inherently, since the Puntambekar does not disclose that the transport interface is selected according a class of service. However, Zheng discloses a system for transporting ATM traffic wherein the ATM connections are given Quality-Of-Service (QOS) requirements that have corresponding parameters (see column 1 lines 33-67)). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to implement the QOS element taught by Zheng in the Puntambekar system because as Zheng point out in column 1 lines 40-49, different types of network traffic require different transmission requirements such as avoiding echoes in voice connections. Thus implementing QOS in Puntambekar would make Puntambekar a more versatile and reliable system.

Art Unit: 2662

11. Claims 21 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Puntambekar in view of Honda and Zheng and further in view of Yang et al. (USPN 5,917,819), hereafter referred to as Yang.

Referring to claims 21 and 30, Puntambekar discloses the system discussed above. Puntambekar does not disclose determining an egress index for the reassembled packet based on the destination address; and using the egress index to forward at least a portion of the reassembled packet to at least one egress connection. However, Yang discloses of an ATM system wherein an output index is determined that is used to based on a destination address of where the cell is to be forwarded on to (see column 5 lines 57-67)). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to implement this feature into Puntambekar because doing so would allow the cell to be properly output from the switch to the correct egress port, thereby making Puntambekar more functional and reliable.

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments filed 05/19/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

On page 10 fourth paragraph regarding the 35 USC 112 second paragraph rejection of claims 23 and 24, the Applicant contends that the claims are clear because "...the process of selecting causes the selected virtual connection to become selected. Thus, among a plurality of virtual connections, "a selected virtual connection" becomes so selected according to the recited step of "selecting..." The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The claim language does not reflect the Applicant's stated arguments. The Claim recites, "...selecting a selected virtual

Art Unit: 2662

connection...” As recited, this claim language *implies* that there is an already selected virtual connection and that this step of the claim is now selecting the already “selected virtual connection”. Since there was no previous mention of any selected virtual connection it is unclear what “selected virtual connection” the claim is referring to. From the Applicant’s stated argument it appears as though rewriting the claim to merely say –selecting a virtual connection...- would overcome the rejection and better clarify this step of the invention.

On page 11 first paragraph the regarding the 35 USC 112 second paragraph rejection of claims 32 and 33, the Applicant argues that the claim is clear and draws on similar arguments as those stated above regarding the rejection of claims 23 and 24. The Examiner respectfully disagrees for the same reasons discussed above. The claim language again seems to imply previous selection steps that are not supported in any of the claims.

On page 11 second paragraph regarding the 35 USC 102(e) rejection of claim 1, that the Puntambekar reference teaches away from the claimed “...wherein the ingress line cards forwards at least a portion of the cell over the switching fabric to at least one of the plurality of egress cards based on the forward decision...” and that Puntambekar rather discloses egress cards transmitting upstream and ingress cards transmitting downstream. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. As pointed out by the reference in column 5 lines 48-56, although the cards are being called “ingress” and “egress”, the actual direction of the signal is irrelevant and so “ingress” cards can also be considered “egress” cards and vice versa since these terms delineate direction of traffic flow and traffic flows in both directions. Thus each card is both an “ingress” and “egress” card and therefore the reference does indeed meet the claimed limitation.

Art Unit: 2662

On page 11 paragraph three the Applicant also contends that Puntambekar is an improper reference because it does not teach of a "...plurality of egress line cards..." The Examiner respectfully disagrees. As discussed above all the cards can be considered "ingress" and/or "egress" therefore there is indeed a plurality of egress cards. Furthermore, Puntambekar points out in column 10 lines 19-22 that "...the trunks connected to a given switch may be connected to *different Cell cards*, rather than to the same card as shown." Thus, Puntambekar clearly shows that a plurality of cards is being used and therefore Puntambekar teaches the claim limitation.

On pages 12-14, regarding the rejection of claims 2-32, the Applicant contends that the claim is allowable over the prior art for the same reasons that were previously stated in the arguments regarding the rejection of claim 1. The Examiner disagrees with these arguments for the same reasons discussed above.

Conclusion

13. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2662

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Odland whose telephone number is 703-305-3231. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8am to 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hassan Kizou, can be reached at (703) 305-4744. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

deo

August 5, 2004



HASSAN KIZOU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600